

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 6-9, 11-16, 18, 19, 33 and 35-37 are currently pending
- Claims 2-5, 27-29 and 31-32 are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 14 and 33 are amended herein

[0003] Claims 1, 14 and 33 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 5. Additionally, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that registering to receive the notification from an operating system occurs via a notification manager, wherein “the notification manager listens to change events from a plurality of named events defined in a registry signaling a change is to be made in a topology streaming media software component.” Support for this additional clarification can be found at least at paragraph [0070] of the originally filed application.

Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Amini: Amini, U.S. Patent No. 6,581,102
- Reisman: Reisman, Richard, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0031058

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-37 Are Non-Obvious Over Amini in view of Reisman.

[0005] Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Amini in view of Reisman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Amini and Reisman. Applicant submits that the combination of Amini and Reisman does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

listening at an application programming interface for a notification indicating that a change is to be made in a topology of streaming media software components, **wherein the change includes at least one of adding or removing one or more streaming media software components to the topology**; and

when the notification is received, notifying a media engine, wherein:

the media engine is capable of reconfiguring the topology in accordance with the indicated change to form a reconfigured topology; and

at least one of the topology or the reconfigured topology has:

one streaming media software component located on a computing device; and

another streaming media software component located on another computing device; and

registering to receive the notification from an operating system via a notification manager, **wherein the notification manager listens to**

change events from a plurality of named events defined in a registry signaling a change is to be made in a topology streaming media software component.

[0007] Claim 1 recites in part, “wherein the change includes at least one of adding or removing one or more streaming media software components to the topology.” The Office cites Amini, Col. 7, lines 35-37 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 7, in rejecting claim 5.) Amini states:

To attempt a connection, the graph manager ensures the target filter has been loaded (911, 912) and adds the target filter to the TargetSet (913).

[0008] Applicant respectfully traverses the Office’s rejection. As noted previously by the Examiner, Amini teaches “notification of changes in the filters state to indicate change to the graph/topology.” (See Office Action, page 3, in rejecting claim 1). The only notification that Amini teaches or suggest is when the system is notified of a change in state. (See Amini, Col. 7, lines 27-52). There is no indication that Amini gives a notification when a change occurs when the change comprises “at least one of adding or removing one or more streaming media software components to the topology.”

[0009] Additionally, Amini does not teach or suggest “registering to receive the notification from an operating system via a notification manager, wherein the notification manager listens to change events from a plurality of named events defined in a registry signaling a change is to be made in a topology streaming media software component” as is presently claimed by independent claim 1. Instead, Amini teaches identifying interfaces by filters which support the load and parse operations. (See Amini, Col. 15,

lines 30-32). Amini does not teach or suggest that a notification manager listens to change events from a plurality of named events to signal “a change made in a topology streaming media software component.”

[0010] Consequently, the combination of Amini and Reisman does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 6-9 and 11-13

[0011] Claims 6-9 and 11-13 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 6-9 and 11-13 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 14 and dependent claims 15, 16, 18 and 19

[0012] Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 14 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 15, 16, 18 and 19.

Independent claim 33 and dependent claims 35-37

[0013] Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 35-37 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 33 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 35-37.

Conclusion

[0014] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-08-19
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090